

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/606,786  | 06/27/2003  | Sandrine Decoster    | 238017US0           | 6389             |  |
| 22850 7590 11/19/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | ARNOLD, ERNST V     |                  |  |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |             |                      | 1616                |                  |  |
|   |             |                      |                     |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |             |                      | 11/19/2007          | ELECTRONIC       |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)    |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/606,786      | DECOSTER ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit        |  |
| Ernst V. Arnold | 1616            |  |

| Bororo tiro r ming or an rippour Biror   | Examiner   | Art Unit                                      |                         |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | Ernst V. Arnold  | 1616  |                         |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add                             | ress                    |  |  |  |  |
| E REPLY FILED <u>09 October 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following   |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| time periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing dat   | e of the final rejection.  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL   | -lianas with 27 OFD 44 27  | file of wide in the comment                   | 646                     |  |  |  |  |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS   |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beauppeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ol>  | onsideration and/or search (see NO<br>ow);<br>etter form for appeal by materially re<br>corresponding number of finally rej  | TE below); ducing or simplifying              |                         |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))  1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.  |  | mpliant Amendment                             | (PTOL-324).             |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | Illowable if submitted in a separate,  | timely filed amendme                          | ent canceling the       |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |  | ll be entered and an e                        | explanation of          |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-43</u> .   |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 44-46.  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa  | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe<br>ry and was not earlier presented. S   | al and/or appellant fa<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)( | ils to provide a<br>1). |  |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the contraction o | on of the status of the claims after e   | ntry is below or attacl                       | ned.                    |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered b<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>   | ut does NOT place the application in   | n condition for allowa                        | nce because:            |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| <b>V.5.</b>  | INFICATED TO THE PROPERTY OF T |   |                         |  |  |  |  |
| \$\tau_{\text{P}} \tau_{\text{P}} \tau_{P  | DUP (ZOD   |   |                         |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references and that the claimed compositions have unexpected benefits. The Examiner cannot agree. The instantly claimed quaternary ammonium silicone polymer is taught in the art for application to the hair. The instantly claimed fatty alcohols are taught in the art for application to the hair. It is merely ordinary innovation to combine the two to arrive at another product for the hair. The alleged benefits do not appear to be surprising at all as explained in the Office Action filed on 7/13/07. Applicant continues to argue about the clear compositions of Janchitraponvej et al. and that one of ordinary skill in the art would not add a fatty alcohol because this would result in a non-transparent composition. This argument is without merit because the addition of the fatty alcohol to the Quaternium 80 polymer produces a transparent composition as demonstrated by Applicant.. In addition, the claims are not commensurate in scope with the showing. Claims 1-43 remain rejected and claims 44-46 are withdrawn.